

## United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/772,509	02/05/2004	Mark Temple	MT001	5674
75	90 . 09/29/2004		EXAM	INER
Mitchell K. McCarthy			CONLEY, FREDRICK C	
P.O. Box 513	•	•		
Piedmont, OK	73078		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,			3673	
			DATE MAILED, 00/20/200	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

\	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
<u> </u>	10/772,509	TEMPLE, MARK				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Fredrick C Conley	3673				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 Fe	ebruary 2004.					
2a) ☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☑ This	action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	wn from consideration.					
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	•					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)	« <b>□</b>	(070,440)				
<ol> <li>Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)</li> <li>Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</li> <li>Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2/5/04</u>.</li> </ol>	4)  Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Di 5)  Notice of Informal F 6)  Other:					

Art Unit: 3673

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 4,853,993 to Walpin.

Claim 14 Walpin discloses a supportive upper body constraint device, comprising:

a base 22; and

means 30 supported by the base for constraining the upper body by imparting a supporting engagement and capable of continuously molding and adjusting to a shape of the upper body maintaining contiguous contact against the upper body.

Claims 14-15 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 6,601,253 to Tarquinio.

Claim 14 Tarquinio discloses a supportive upper body constraint device, comprising:

a base 24; and

means 20 supported by the base for constraining the upper body by imparting a supporting engagement continuously molding and adjusting to a shape of the upper body maintaining contiguous contact against the upper body.

Claim 15, wherein the means for constraining is characterized by a cover comprising a visco-elastic foam material (col. 3 lines 3-6).

Claim 19, wherein the means for constraining is characterized by the cover comprising a foam material with an ILD ratio less than 14 (col. 3 lines 3-6).

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-2, 4-6, 18, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,601,253 to Tarquinio.

Claim 1, Tarquinio discloses a supportive upper body constraint device, comprising:

a base 24 comprising a foam material with an impression load deflection and a cover 20 on the base comprising a foam material with an ILD ratio less than the base (col. 1 lines 27-35). Tarquinio fails to disclose the ILD ratio greater than 40. It would have been an obvious to have the ILD ratio greater than 40, since Applicant has not disclosed that the ILD rations are critical and it would appear that the ILD ratios of Tarquinio would perform equally well.

Claim 2, wherein the cover comprises an elastomeric foam material with an ILD ratio less than about 14 (col. 3 lines 3-6).

Art Unit: 3673

Claim 4, wherein the cover comprises a material having a smooth surface (fig. 1).

Claim 5, wherein the base and support members are unitarily constructed.

Claims 6 and 20, Tarquinio fails to disclose the density of the cover in the range of about 3.8 to 4 pounds per cubic foot. It would have been an obvious to have the density stated above, since Applicant has not disclosed that the specific density is critical and it would appear that the density of Tarquinio would perform equally well.

Claim 18, Tarquinio fails to disclose the ILD ratio of the base greater than 40. It would have been an obvious to have the ILD ratio greater than 40, since Applicant has not disclosed that the ILD rations are critical and it would appear that the ILD ratios of Tarquinio would perform equally well.

Claims 1-3, 5-13, and 15-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 4,853,993 to Walpin et al. in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,601,253 to Tarquinio.

Claim 1, Walpin discloses a supportive upper body constraint device, comprising: a base 22

a cover 30 on the base. Walpin fails to disclose the cover having an ILD ratio less than the base. Tarquinio discloses a cushion having a cover 20 with an ILD ratio less than a base 24 (col. 1 lines 27-35). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have ILD ratios as taught by Tarquinio in order to provide reduced compression of the mattress when a weight is placed on the upper surface of the cushion. Walpin also fails to disclose the ILD ratio of

Art Unit: 3673

than 40, since Applicant has not disclosed that ILD ratios are critical and it would appear that the ILD ratio of Walpin would perform equally well.

Claim 2, wherein the cover comprises an elastomeric foam material with an ILD ratio less than about 14 (col. 3 lines 3-6)(Tarquinio).

Claim 3, further comprising opposing support members (26,27) on the base, the cover disposed in a concave contour defining a cavity (fig. 6)(Walpin).

Claim 5, wherein the base and support members are unitarily constructed.

Claim 6, Walpin, as modified, fails to disclose the density of the cover in the range of about 3.8 to 4 pounds per cubic foot. It would have been an obvious to have the density stated above, since Applicant has not disclosed that the specific density is critical and it would appear that the density of Walpin would perform equally well.

Claim 7, Walpin discloses a supportive upper body constraint device, comprising: a base (15,21,22) comprising a substantially flat longitudinal surface and an inclined surface (fig. 5);

a pair of opposing support members (26,27) on the inclined surface; and a cover 30 continuously covering the support members. Walpin fails to disclose a portion of the inclined surface between the support members comprising a viscoelastic foam material. Tarquinio discloses cushion having a cover 20 with a portion of a surface between support members (26,28) comprising a viscoelastic foam material. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have a cover of visco-elastic foam material as taught by Tarquinio in order

Art Unit: 3673

to provide reduced compression of the mattress when a weight is placed on the upper surface of the cushion.

Claim 8, wherein the support members are wedge-shaped, the cover disposed in a concave contour defining a cavity (fig. 6)(Walpin).

Claim 9, wherein the cover 20 comprises a smooth surface (Tarquinio).

Claim 10, wherein the base and support members are unitarily formed.

Claim 11, Walpin also fails to disclose the ILD ratio of the base greater than 40. It would have been an obvious to have the ILD ratio greater than 40, since Applicant has not disclosed that ILD ratios are critical and it would appear that the ILD ratio of Walpin would perform equally well.

Claim 12, wherein the cover comprises a foam material with an ILD ratio less than 14 (col. 3 lines 3-6)(Tarquinio).

Claim 13, Walpin fails to disclose the density of the cover in the range of about 3.8 to 4 pounds per cubic foot. It would have been an obvious to have the density stated above, since Applicant has not disclosed that the specific density is critical and it would appear that the density of Walpin would perform equally well.

Claim 15, Walpin discloses all of the Applicant's claimed limitations except wherein the means for constraining is characterized by a cover comprising a visco-elastic foam material. Tarquinio discloses cushion having a cover 20 comprising a visco-elastic foam material. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have a cover of visco-elastic foam material as

Art Unit: 3673

taught by Tarquinio in order to provide reduced compression of the mattress when a weight is placed on the upper surface of the cushion.

Claim 16. The device of claim 15 wherein the means for constraining is characterized

by opposing support members (26,27) on the base supporting the cover in a concave contour defining a central cavity (fig. 6)(Walpin).

Claim 17, wherein the means for constraining is characterized by wedge-shaped support members.

Claim 18, Walpin also fails to disclose the ILD ratio of the base greater than 40. It would have been an obvious to have the ILD ratio greater than 40, since Applicant has not disclosed that ILD ratios are critical and it would appear that the ILD ratio of Walpin would perform equally well.

Claim 19, wherein the means for constraining is characterized by the cover comprising a foam material with an ILD ratio less than 14 (col. 3 lines 3-6)(Tarquinio).

Claim 20, Walpin fails to disclose the density of the cover in the range of about 3.8 to 4 pounds per cubic foot. It would have been an obvious to have the density stated above, since Applicant has not disclosed that the specific density is critical and it would appear that the density of Walpin would perform equally well.

Art Unit: 3673

## Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Fredrick C Conley whose telephone number is 308-7468. The examiner can normally be reached on m-th m-fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Shackelford can be reached on 308-2978. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

FC

MICHAEL F. TRETTEL PRIMARY EXAMINER ART UNIT 358 Page 8